SUBJECTS.

Dewan's reply .—The orders as they now stand *do* provide for the transfer of a Nirthal land to the head of poramboke, if, in the opinion of the Division Peishkar, it is deemed necessary to reserve such land for a public or communal purpose. The suggestion that a list should now be made out of all Nirthal lands and published is not considered a practicable one. The Peishkars tell me that the ryots generally know what the Nirthal lands are in each village and it is also open to the ryots to apply, in cases of doubt, for information to the village or taluk officers.

7. *Modification of the rules regarding the minimum rate of assessment fixed for puduval lands and the arrears of tax payable on such lands.*

Mr. Padmanabhan Parameswaran (Member, Pathanapuram Taluk) represented that the recent order of Government fixing a minimum assessment of 5 fanams per acre on puduval lands in the Quilon and Kottayam divisions operated harshly on the ryots. He said that the rate was being adopted by the Revenue department irrespective of the nature of the soil and the *tharam* put upon the lands at the settlement. The rule worked special hardship in the cases of old applications for the registry of puduval lands, as in those cases, even the back arrears, which were being recovered from 1066, were calculated at the enhanced rate. He observed that it could not have been the intention of Government to give the rule any retrospective effect so as to make it applicable even to back arrears. By the operation of the new rule, it was the poor ryots that suffered heavily. He therefore requested that the decision of Government might be favourably reconsidered and orders issued for lands being registered at the old rates of assessment, at least in the cases of poor people who applied for them for purposes of house-building.

Dewan's reply .—The five fanams minimum rate is considered reasonable and it will not be reduced. The question of back arrears, however, is a serious matter. It is one affecting the whole State. It cannot therefore be disposed of solely on the representations of one or two taluks. I shall call on all the Peishkars to report soon on the question, and, as soon as the reports are received, Government will pass orders on the question as reasonably as they can.

8. *Modification of the rules for the grant of remission of tax in cases of failure of crops.*

Mr. S. Subramonia Karayalan (Member, Shencottah Taluk) represented that the ryots experienced great hardship in the practical working of the remission rules. The difficulty was specially felt in cases in which there was only a partial failure of crops. In such cases, the ryots were at present seldom or never granted any remission, though the produce collected from the lands would

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

not cover even the expenses of cultivation. The rules did not lay down any well-defined procedure to be adopted by the inspecting officers. He therefore suggested the desirability of appointing respectable ryots as Thadasthers for each village, and said that, if they be asked to work in conjunction with the Government officers in inspecting the lands and deciding whether or not remissions should be granted, it would be a great boon to the ryots.

Dewan's reply.—The grant of *karivu* remission in the Shencottah taluk is now regulated by the following orders, *viz.*, (1) Proclamation dated 22-12-1024; (2) Huzur order dated 29-1-1036; (3) Proclamation dated 14-1-1070; and (4) Proclamation dated 22-12-1070. The rules as they now stand are not defective.

9. *Complaints regarding the settlement of the Kallupara proverthi belonging to the Edappally Chief.*

Mr. K. N. Mamman Mappilla (Member, Thiruvalla Taluk) pointed out that the settlement of the Kallupara proverthy, belonging to the Edappally Chief, was not being conducted on the lines adopted for the settlement of Sirkar lands. He invited attention to the provisions of Sections 2 and 3 of the Estates' Rent Recovery Regulation, IV of 1068, which distinctly laid down that the rights of holders of land under the Edappally Chief were the same as those of the ryots holding Sirkar lands and that the rent recoverable from the former should be assessed at the rates adopted in the case of Sirkar lands. Those principles, which were kept in view at the previous settlements, were not followed at the recent settlement of the proverthy. While, in the case of Sirkar lands, pattas were granted fixing one-fourth the tax as recoverable at the new commutation rate of 11 chs. per para of paddy and the remaining three-fourths at the old vilatharam rate of 6 chs. per para, the ryots holding lands in the proverthy were being compelled to pay one-half the tax at the rate of 11 chs. and the other half at 6 chs. per para of paddy. That was against the spirit of the Regulation and would work great hardship on the ryots. As regards the *tharavila* and value of trees, however, the Sirkar rates, which were more favourable to the Chief, were adopted. It would thus be observed that there was no consistency of procedure or uniformity of principle in the settlement operations as now conducted in the proverthy. He therefore requested that the pattas might be revised in strict conformity with those issued for Sirkar lands, and that, if the Chief would not agree to that course, Government should refuse to collect the tax for the Chief under the Regulation.

Dewan's reply.— The report of the Settlement Peishkar will be called for on the grievances now brought to notice,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly